



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/024,885

02/17/1998

DAVID ROTH

T1680CIP2

8884

7590

05/28/2004

Marc C Van Ness  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman  
12400 Wilshire Blvd  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

EXAMINER

ABRAMS, NEIL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2839

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/024,885

Applicant(s)

ROTH  
SEARL ET AL.

Examiner

Neil Abrams

Art Unit

2839

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.  
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);  
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): claims 128, 141-143.  
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.  
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: 128, 141-143.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: all others (80-85, 94, 117-126, 133-140, 144-156)

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
NEIL ABRAMS  
EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 322

ATTACHMENT TO PTOL 303

For claim 124 ,the Okada movable bottom is useful in Aldous ,fig 15 since it would protect the contacts when no plug is present, the Aldous stop could be omitted in the modified device therefor the rejection is considered proper.

For claim 144 the McDaniels 405 fig 13 pivoting cover is on adapter 200 not on the end of the card as recited in the claim therefor does not provide adequate support for claim limitations .

For Claims 80,133 , as one example, the RD direction change /noise reduction features would be useful in the Aldous, fig 8, system. The "overall length" limitation is not of such specific nature as to avoid the rejection, the length ( 3.4 inches listed in some documents ) is not specifically stated in the spec . and might be changed at some future time or might cover a range of lengths. Obvious Type III then would be met the fig 8 card with the small added length required by an adapter designed for use with the card . Also obvious to form the adapter to add a small length, (10 or 15 mm) to the unitary module whereby the combination would meet claim limitations. The invention that avoids the reference might be in the use of a module with a pull-out support (fig 22 at 362) for the plug 10 that enables the smaller overall length when the support is retracted.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: For Claim 80, , the line 4 "removable insertion" limitation defines over Aldous fig 10 type card ,

without modification, where module 72 is only capable of partial removal from recess 76. This also applies to claim 133.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Neil Abrams at telephone number 571 272 2089.

NA 5-25-2004